

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/779,719

Applicant(s)

VAN STRAATEN, WILLEM
JOHANNES

Examiner

Jordan M. Schwartz

Art Unit

2873

All Participants:(1) Jordan M. Schwartz.(2) Michael S. Huppert.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 April 2005**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 7-8, 10, 16

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: With reference to claim 1, the limitation "of at least 60% at least in the spectral range of 560 to 660 nm" (and the similar limitation of claim 2) was discussed as to the intended meaning. It was not clear if applicant meant the claimed absorption anywhere within the claimed spectral range or if applicant meant the claimed absorption "over" i.e. throughout the claimed spectral range. If the former was the intended meaning then claim 2 would be a broader claim and would therefore be improper as not being further limiting. The intended meaning by applicant was "over" the claimed spectral range in which case claim 2 is a narrower claim and therefore is proper for providing a further limitation. It was therefore agreed to amend claims 1 and 2 as set forth in the attached examiner's amendment to provide additional clarity. The changes to claims 7-8, 10, 16, and to the specification, as set forth in the examiner's amendment, were discussed and agreed upon to express the decimal points as "periods" and not "commas". The Examiner's Amendment to the Abstract was discussed and agreed upon so that the abstract would be in the form of a single paragraph in compliance with the MPEP.